

Hospital Foundation's annual gala in November, of which the proceeds will support seminars, support groups, community outreach and diagnostic testing at The Women's Center of St. Helena Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we acknowledge and honor Mr. Joseph Phelps for his continued support and tremendous contributions to the communities of Napa Valley.

# PHYSICAL SECURITY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE INFORMATION

## HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 18, 2000*

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the following letter associated with my remarks of October 17 contained on page E1808 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
FOR COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND INTELLIGENCE,

*Washington, DC, September 29, 2000.*

Hon. BOB RILEY,  
*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RILEY: This is in response to your letter to Secretary Cohen concerning the \$10 million that Congress appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79) to be available only for retrofitting security containers that are under the control of, or that are accessible by, defense contractors. Secretary Cohen has asked me to respond since this is a matter under my direct purview. Thank you for your letter.

As you may be aware, the Joint Security Commission II, led by retired General Welch, addressed this issue in the Commission's report dated August 24, 1999. The Commission found that a program calling for industry to convert to the electronic lock would be potentially expensive with little commensurate benefit in terms of improved security. The Commission estimated that the cost of such a program for only 5 of the many Defense Contractors would exceed \$100 million. The Commission further recommended that these funds would be better spent to augment the Defense Security Service's National Industrial Security Program and to provide at least some of the wherewithal for expediting the personnel security process for industry. The threats we face are not from people breaking into locked containers, but rather from computer network attacks, signal intercepts, and security cleared insiders who compromise national security.

After careful consideration, Secretary Cohen earlier this year concluded that "retrofitting industry locks would impose a large expense on taxpayers without a commensurate security benefit," and so advised Congress in his letter of January 18, 2000.

We understand and share your desire to improve the physical security of national defense information and will continue to work toward that goal.

Sincerely,

(For Arthur L. Money).

# WEST PAPUA, INDONESIA; THE NEXT EAST TIMOR TRAGEDY

## HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 18, 2000*

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I come before our colleagues and our great Nation tonight to discuss a disturbing matter I have raised before—the bloody struggle for freedom and democracy that is being waged halfway around the world in the Pacific by the courageous people of West Papua, a province subjugated by Indonesia and renamed Irian Jaya.

Although many of our colleagues are familiar with Indonesia's atrocious and despicable record of human rights violations in East Timor and West Timor—the world has neglected to address the parallel tragedy that is being played out as we speak in West Papua.

Indonesian President Abdurrahman Wahid, to his credit, has attempted to engage the people of West Papua, in a national dialogue to defuse the incredible tensions arising from four decades of military repression and violence perpetrated against the Papuan people. As part of his peace initiative, President Wahid expressly authorized Papuans to raise their Morning Star flags, a deeply emotional symbol of the Papuan people's desire for justice and self-determination.

In recent weeks, however, armed Indonesian security forces have violated President Wahid's order, perhaps based upon a conflicting directive from Vice President Megawati Sukarnoputri, and forcibly taken down Morning Star flags in the mountainside town of Wamena. This touched off a massive riot resulting in upwards of 58 deaths and dozens of injured citizens.

On Monday (October 9, 2000), Amnesty International reported that, "Indonesian security forces opened fire during attempts to forcibly remove Papuan flags flying in several locations in Wamena town." With hundreds of people taken into custody, Amnesty International stated that, "some of those released told local human rights monitors that they witnessed other detainees being tortured by the police. The police reportedly beat, kicked and used razor blades to torture those who refused to renounce support for Papuan independence." Amnesty International, in particular, took note that 15 individuals have been denied total access to their attorneys and families, raising fears that these Papuans are being tortured or subject to extrajudicial execution.

Mr. Speaker, these recent developments in Indonesia's campaign of violence against the Papuan people are shocking and reprehensible. However, I am not surprised by this ugly show of brutality, for it is nothing new. It is part and parcel of a long history of Jakarta's oppression of the native people of West Papua.

The first chapter in this tragic story began in 1961, when the people of West Papua, with the assistance of the Netherlands and Australia, prepared to declare independence from the Dutch, their former colonial master. This enraged Indonesia, which invaded West Papua and urged war against Holland. Skillfully playing the Communist card against the United States, Indonesia simultaneously threatened to become a Soviet ally, prompting

the United States to take Jakarta's side in the West Papua issue. Once the Dutch were advised by President Kennedy's administration that they could not count on United States backing in a conflict with Indonesia, the Netherlands ceased support for West Papua's independence and deserted the Papuan people. Indonesia was thus given a green light to ravage West Papua in 1963, destroying the Papuan people's dreams of freedom and self-determination.

In 1969, the second chapter unfolded, when the United Nations supervised a fraudulent referendum called the "Act of Free Choice", which, upon review, was clearly designed to give cover and official sanctioning of Indonesia's forced occupation of West Papua. West Papuans derisively refer to it as the "Act of No Choice", since only 1,025 delegates hand-picked by Jakarta were allowed to vote, with bribery and death threats used to coerce them. The rest of the 800,000 citizens of West Papua had absolutely no say in the rigged plebiscite. Despite calling for a "one person-one vote" referendum, the United Nations shamefully acquiesced and recognized the defective vote—a vote which, not surprisingly, was unanimous for West Papua to remain with Indonesia.

Since Indonesia and its military subjugated West Papua, the Papuan people have suffered under one of the most repressive and violent systems of colonial occupation in the twentieth century. Incredible as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, as the world witnessed in East Timor, the estimate of West Papuans who have been killed or who have simply vanished from the fact of the earth during the Indonesian occupation numbers in the hundreds of thousands. Papuans project that between 200,000 to 300,000 of their people have disappeared at the hands of the Indonesians.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years our Nation has rightfully intervened to stop ethnic cleansing and genocide, such as in Kosovo, yet for decades in West Papua the Indonesians have been allowed to commit outrageous human rights abuses of the highest magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, the depth and intensity of this conflict spanning four decades underscores the fact that the people of West Papua do not desire and will never accept being part of Indonesia. In all ways, manner and fashion, they are a people and culture dramatically distinct and apart from the rest of Indonesia.

In an attempt to overwhelm the Papuan people, the Indonesian Government has chosen a policy of mass transmigration, not unlike what China is doing in Tibet. The West Papuan people have been inundated with an annual influx of over 10,000 families from the rest of Indonesia. Already, the migrants threaten to outnumber the West Papuans, reducing the indigenous natives to a minority in their own homeland.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic situation in West Papua greatly concerns me. With Jakarta's renewed thirst for blood, I would ask that all of our colleagues join in urging the Indonesian Government to exercise restraint and immediately stop the killings and human rights violations in West Papua.

To that effect, Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, our colleagues—Representatives JOHN LEWIS, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, LANE EVANS, DONALD PAYNE, ROBERT WEXLER, ALCEE HASTINGS and GREGORY MEEKS—joined me in a letter to President Clinton strongly expressing our deep

concerns with Indonesia's repression in West Papua and requesting that the "U.S. ensure that the Indonesian military and police refrain from any violent response" to the Papuan people's advocacy for independence. Our letter further requested the Administration to work with United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan in undertaking a thorough and complete review of the 1969 U.N. "Act of Free Choice".

I commend President Clinton for his forthright response and gracious letter, in which the President stated, "The U.S. response to events in West Papua is aimed at minimizing the likelihood of violence and promoting reconciliation between Papua and the Indonesian government." The President further stated " \* \* \* we have strongly urged Indonesia to uphold justice, human rights, and the rule of law in Papua and to refrain from using tactics of repression similar to those that were condemned by the world community in East Timor. We will continue to impress on Indonesia's leaders the high costs associated with any attempt to use military-backed militias to incite violence or to intimidate the people of Papua."

I thank the President for his stated commitment to stop Indonesia's practices of brutality in West Papua and look forward to concrete, timely action from the Administration in response to the recent troubling developments in West Papua.

Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the free world and protector of the oppressed, our great Nation cannot in good conscience continue to look away as another nightmare like East Timor raises its ugly head. I ask our colleagues to hear the urgent pleas for help of the people of West Papua and take steps now with the Administration to prevent another East Timor massacre from taking place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I submit the aforementioned letters regarding West Papua from our colleagues and President Clinton for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 30, 2000.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

President, *The White House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are deeply concerned with recent developments in Papua, also known as West Papua or Irian Jaya, the eastern-most part of Indonesia. The Second Papuan People's Congress ended the first week of June with a declaration of independence from Indonesia, to which the Indonesian government responded by declaring it would take all action necessary to maintain the state's territorial integrity.

This independence declaration—dated retroactively to December 1, 1961, when Papuan leaders first declared Papua a sovereign nation separate from its Dutch colonial rulers—follows years of economic exploitation and human rights violations by the Indonesian government and military regime. The decisions of the Papuan Congress, attended by five hundred delegated representatives, more than two thousand others inside the hall and some twenty thousand supporters outside, reflect views held widely throughout the territory. While it is premature for the U.S. government to take a stand in favor or against the declaration adopted by the Papuan Congress, we feel that the State Department should at least demonstrate an understanding of the underlying reasons for the decision taken by the Papuan representatives.

The independence declaration of the Second Papuan People's Conference reflects over

thirty years of grievance resulting from a fraudulent Act of Free Choice held in 1969. A brutally repressive military regime organized the Act, refusing universal suffrage and convening an assembly of only 1,025 hand-picked men. They met under extreme duress and at gunpoint, resulting in an "unanimous" decision to remain with Indonesia. To its detriment, the United Nations, which was supposed to supervise the Act but was marginalized throughout the process, endorsed the results and has done virtually nothing to protect the rights and freedoms of the Papuan people since then.

The U.S. government must take responsibility for the diplomatic moves leading to the U.N.'s betrayal of the Papuans. U.S. administrations were instrumental in negotiating talks between Indonesia and the Netherlands about Papua, resulting in the New York Agreement in 1962 and the eventual Act of Free Choice. The talks, over which a U.S. diplomat preside, took place without any Papuan representation and were followed by six years of extreme repression capped by the denial of the right to a genuine act of self-determination. Having brokered an agreement providing for the Act of Free Choice, the U.S. government had a responsibility to ensure its fair implementation. Yet despite egregious human rights violations perpetrated against the Papuan people, the U.S. voted in favor of U.N. General Assembly Resolution 2504 of December 19 in 1969, recognizing the official inclusion of Papua in the Indonesian state.

Given the involvement of the U.S. in the aforementioned agreements, we request that the Administration call upon the U.N. Secretary General to undertake a thorough review of the 1969 Act of Free Choice. We remain deeply concerned about escalating activities in Papua of pro-Indonesia militia groups, similar to those that operated in East Timor, many of whom are linked to the Indonesian Armed Forces. We further request that the U.S. ensure that the Indonesian military and police refrain from any violent response to the declaration of independence, as has already been suggested by some in the Indonesian security forces and government. We will continue to diligently monitor the situation in Papua, particularly in the context of severe military repression throughout the Indonesian archipelago.

We thank you for your serious consideration of our requests and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Donald M. Payne, Robert Wexler, Alcee L. Hastings, Cynthia A. McKinney, Lane Evans, John Lewis, Gregory W. Meeks.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, DC, July 9, 2000.

Hon. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR ENI: Thank you for your letter regarding recent developments in West Papua, Indonesia.

The U.S. response to events in West Papua is aimed at minimizing the likelihood of violence and promoting reconciliation between Papua and the Indonesian government. Our policy is based on three principles.

First, we have reiterated our support for the territorial integrity of Indonesia. We continue to believe that a stable, democratic and united Indonesia is the key to continued stability in the region.

Second, we have publicly called for the Government of Indonesia to address the legitimate concerns of the residents of Papua within the context of a unified Indonesia. We strongly support a meaningful dialogue between the Government of Indonesia and Pap-

uan political representatives as the best and most appropriate means to address the underlying problems that have led to calls for independence. Such a dialogue is the appropriate form to discuss any potential review of the UN-sanctioned process that resulted in West Papua's inclusion into Indonesia.

Third, we have strongly urged Indonesia to uphold justice, human rights, and the rule of law in Papua and to refrain from using tactics of repression similar to those that were condemned by the world community in East Timor. We will continue to impress on Indonesia's leaders the high costs associated with any attempt to use military-backed militias to incite violence or to intimidate the people of Papua.

I appreciate your interest in Papua and look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure the peaceful resolution of the situation.

Sincerely,

BILL.

## AIR FORCE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Air Force Science and Technology for the 21st Century Act, a bill to strengthen the Science and Technology (S&T) program of the U.S. Air Force.

Today, the Air Force S&T program is a shadow of what it once was. Spending has been slashed from its high water mark a decade ago. Research focus has shifted from long-term topics with the potential for revolutionary advances to projects that have only short-term, incremental payoff. Morale among scientists in the Air Force Research Laboratory is down as a result of layoffs, budget cuts, and an uncertain future for the S&T program. In recent years, we've seen a pattern where research programs are funded, then cut by the Air Force, then restored by Congress. This roller coaster trend results in inefficiency and loss of continuity.

The decline has begun to set off alarm bells outside the Air Force. Earlier this year, the Air Force Association—one of the Air Force's strongest allies—issued a blistering report, concluding that by not treating research and development as a high priority, the Air Force has "shortchanged the nation's future military-technological edge" which "could cost the nation dearly on future battlefields." Last month, a coalition representing one million scientists and engineers warned that the "chronic decline in Federal funding going to aeronautics research," including Pentagon spending, could result in a "catastrophic loss."

Prodding by Congress apparently has failed to move scientific research to a higher Air Force priority. In 1998, Congress passed a resolution urging an increase in the science and technology budget of the Defense Department by 2 percent (adjusted for inflation). When the Air Force refused to comply, I offered legislation the following year repeating the request, singling out the Air Force for jeopardizing the stability of the defense science and technology base. Though the legislation was enacted into law, the Air Force still failed